

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on April 1, 2008.

Claims 1, 9, 13, 18, and 25 are amended; claim 26 has been cancelled, without prejudice to the Applicant; as a result, claims 1-25 and 27-31 are now pending in this application.

Support for the amendments is present throughout the original filed specification. By way of example only, the Examiner's attention is directed to the original filed specification paragraphs 22, 31, and 57.

#### **§102 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for being anticipated by Asano (U.S. 7,088,822). It is of course fundamental that in order to sustain an anticipation rejection that each and every claim limitation must be taught or suggested in the exact detail and identical arrangement in the cited reference.

With respect to amended independent claims 1 and 13, Asano fails to teach the amended limitations of the trust specification that defines a contract, which defines a relationship between a collaborator and the document. The contract also defines policies, authentication requirements, and identify information required before the collaborator can access the document. Asano is entirely devoid of this teaching.

Moreover, Asano is entirely devoid of any authentication involving a document. At best, Asano briefly mentions authentication between devices but not with respect to a document. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests what it is in the Asano reference that is being viewed as collaborators, since Applicant respectfully asserts that Applicant cannot reasonably find any such entity either expressly or suggestively. For that matter, Asano does not discuss documents anywhere either and in any form.

With respect to amended independent claims 18 and 25, the Asano reference fails to teach or even remotely suggest having the document (if a document exists at all in Asano) maintain a list of collaborators (if a collaborator exists at all in Asano). Moreover, even if the Examiner can come up with some interpretation with respect to this, that interpretation would still include limitations where the list of collaborators include identities for each collaborator that

are used to permissibly grant access to the document. So, the rejections with respect to claim 18 and its dependents should be withdrawn and these claims allowed.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the rejections of record should be withdrawn and the claims allowed. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.


If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(513) 942-0224

Date 07/01/08

By /

  
Joseph P. Mehrle  
Reg. No. 45,535